

USPN 6, 396,285 (Blackham). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Below, Applicant discusses subject matter in the independent claims 1, 9 and 15 not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. On the basis of this, Applicant believes all the claims are patentable over the cited art.

Discussion of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 sets out a method for testing a frequency converter. In step (a) labels for a plurality of mixing products are displayed. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner. Examiner has argued that this step is disclosed by instrument 10 shown in Figure 1 of Johnson. This is incorrect.

Johnson discloses a network test instrument. The network instrument does not test a frequency converter. Instrument 10 shown in Johnson does not display labels for a plurality of mixing products. Instrument 10 does not even perform any tests for mixing products. Nothing in Johnson discloses or suggests anything about mixing products or displaying labels for mixing products.

Step (b) of claim 1 states that in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, substeps (b1) and (b2) are performed. Examiner has argued that this part of step (b) is disclosed by Johnson at column 2, lines 66-67. At column 2, lines 66-67, Johnson states the following: "A stylus 14 is employable by a user to interact with the device by writing or tapping the screen to enter and select data." This section of Johnson does not disclose or suggest a user selecting a first mixing product from a

plurality of mixing products, as set out in step (b) of claim 1. Nothing in Johnson discloses or suggests anything about mixing products or a user selecting mixing products.

In substep (b1) of claim 1, appropriate frequencies for the first mixing product are calculated in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Examiner has argued that this is disclosed by Clark at column 12, lines 63 through 65. At column 12, lines 63 through 65, Clark states the following "To make a SSB FTD measurement using the SSB method, a SSB FTD DUT is selected, for example, a 20.0 to 8.0 GHz SSB FTD DUT down converter." This statement by Clark does not disclose or suggest calculating appropriate frequencies for a first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, as set out in step (b1) of claim 1.

This section of Clark is determining selection of a device under test (DUT). The DUT is a 20.0 to 8.0 GHz single sideband (SBB) frequency translating device (FTD) device under test (DUT) down converter. Selecting a DUT, as disclosed by Clark, is clearly different than calculating appropriate frequencies for a first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, as set out in step (b1) of claim 1.

In substep (b2) a measurement configuration for the first mixing product is determined in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products. Examiner has argued that Figures 5A-E and 6 are measurement configurations. While Figures 5A-E and 6 are measurement

configurations, these measurement configurations are specifically user selected and are not determined in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from a plurality of mixing products, as set out in step (b) and substep (b2).

Discussion of Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 sets out an interface for a tester. The tester includes a table that defines a plurality of mixing products. The table includes labels for the plurality of mixing products. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner.

Examiner has argued that this table is disclosed by Table 4 shown in Blackham. Table 4 of Blackham lists a mapping between the characterized error terms from three two-port calibrations to a three-port error correction. See Blackham at column 4, lines 62 through 64. Table 4 of Blackham thus lists a mapping between characterized error terms. Table 4 of Blackham does not disclose or suggest a table within a tester that defines a plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 9. Further, Table 4 of Blackham does not contain or suggest labels for the plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 9.

Claim 9 sets out that the tester also includes a first display interface that displays at least a subset of the labels for the plurality of mixing products. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Examiner has argued that display of such labels is disclosed by instrument 10 shown in Figure 1 of Johnson. This is incorrect.

Johnson discloses a network test instrument. The network instrument does not test a frequency converter. Instrument 10 shown in Johnson does not display labels for a plurality of mixing products. Instrument 10 does not even perform any tests for mixing products. Nothing in Johnson discloses or suggests anything about mixing products or displaying labels for mixing products.

Claim 9 sets out that the tester also includes a processor that, in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, calculates appropriate frequencies for the first mixing product, and determines a measurement configuration for the first mixing product. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Examiner has argued that Clark at column 12, lines 63 through 65 discloses calculating appropriate frequencies for the first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products. This is incorrect

At column 12, lines 63 through 65, Clark states the following "To make a SSB FTD measurement using the SSB method, a SSB FTD DUT is selected, for example, a 20.0 to 8.0 GHz SSB FTD DUT down converter." This statement by Clark does not disclose or suggest calculating appropriate frequencies for a first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 9.

This section of Clark is determining selection of a device under test (DUT). The DUT is a 20.0 to 8.0 GHz single sideband (SBB) frequency translating device (FTD) device under test (DUT) down converter. Selecting a DUT, as

disclosed by Clark, is clearly different than calculating appropriate frequencies for a first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 9.

Discussion of Independent Claim 15

Claim 15 sets out an interface for a tester. The tester includes a table means for defining a plurality of mixing products. The table means includes labels for the plurality of mixing products. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner.

Examiner has argued that this table means is disclosed by Table 4 shown in Blackham. Table 4 of Blackham lists a mapping between the characterized error terms from three two-port calibrations to a three-port error correction. See Blackham at column 4, lines 62 through 64. Table 4 of Blackham thus lists a mapping between characterized error terms. Table 4 of Blackham does not disclose or suggest a table means within a tester that defines a plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 15. Further, Table 4 of Blackham does not contain or suggest labels for the plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 15.

Claim 15 sets out that the tester also includes a interface means that displays at least a subset of the labels for the plurality of mixing products. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Examiner has argued that display of such labels is disclosed by instrument 10 shown in Figure 1 of Johnson. This is incorrect.

Johnson discloses a network test instrument. The network instrument does not test a frequency converter. Instrument 10 shown in Johnson does not display labels for a plurality of mixing products. Instrument 10 does not even perform any tests for mixing products. Nothing in Johnson discloses or suggests anything about mixing products or displaying labels for mixing products.

Claim 15 sets out that the tester also includes a processor means for, in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, calculating appropriate frequencies for the first mixing product, and determining a measurement configuration for the first mixing product. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Examiner has argued that Clark at column 12, lines 63 through 65 discloses calculating appropriate frequencies for the first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products. This is incorrect

At column 12, lines 63 through 65, Clark states the following "To make a SSB FTD measurement using the SSB method, a SSB FTD DUT is selected, for example, a 20.0 to 8.0 GHz SSB FTD DUT down converter." This statement by Clark does not disclose or suggest calculating appropriate frequencies for a first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 15.


This section of Clark is determining selection of a device under test (DUT). The DUT is a 20.0 to 8.0 GHz single sideband (SBB) frequency translating device (FTD) device under test (DUT) down converter. Selecting a DUT, as

disclosed by Clark, is clearly different than calculating appropriate frequencies for a first mixing product in response to a user selecting a first mixing product from the plurality of mixing products, as set out in claim 15.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this Amendment has placed the present application in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
ERIC ALAN SHANK
DARA SARIASLANI
GRATZ L. ARMSTRONG
DEXTER M. YAMAGUCHI

By 
Douglas L. Weller
Reg. No. 30,506

February 16, 2005
Santa Clara, California
(408) 985-0642